

January 22, 1976

SENATOR CARSTEN: My understanding is, Senator Dickinson, that we will revert back to the 5% period.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Would you agree, Senator Carsten, that, in fact, and I have heard a lot about flexibility by yourself and others that are talking about this bill, that probably, in fact, we are not talking about flexibility at all. That wherever we set it, the bottom figure is going to be the figure that, without much question, the figure that will be used by any Board of Equalization. The top figure seems to be something that someone thought we ought to have in the statute books to make the whole thing legitimate. But, in fact, we are talking about a floor that the Board of Equalization will use in considering an overlevy for a safety requirement in setting their budget. Would you think this is true or not?

SENATOR CARSTEN: I would not agree with that wholeheartedly, Senator Dickinson. I think that as I view the Board of Equalization, as the concept of the Board of Equalization was formed, and what happens after that we do not have exact control over, but I do not look at it as a setting of a rigid lower figure for a minimum as it. I think that it is a factor that the Board of Equalization does take into consideration when they set the rates, and with any reasonable doubt of what the projections might be, that factor is taken into consideration and I would disagree that it is used solely as a floor for that portion of it, Senator Dickinson.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Thank you, Senator Carsten. I am not through, Senator Savage.

SENATOR SAVAGE: I didn't say anything.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Well, they cut me off for a moment.

SENATOR SAVAGE: I didn't.

SENATOR DICKINSON: You are the boss. A couple of Senators have commented that we should have this flexibility to use in case we were facing a situation where, in fact, it might require an increase in tax levy. If we use it for that purpose, it appears to me we have totally defeated the purpose and idea of having an overlevy requirement. If that is what it is for to be bandied around depending upon what the tax levy may, in fact, result being, then we have totally lost the purpose of an overlevy concept. So I think we are only talking about whether it should be 5% or whether it should be 3% or whatever it is now, and it will revert back to 5% and we have lived with that without any question for a long time, if we take no action. So based on that, I will oppose it with the present 3% amendment.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Mahoney.

SENATOR MAHONEY: Mr. President, in defense of our Chairman, I would like, the Senators who stood on the floor today and quizzed as to the minutes that were spent in deliberation and in study, Senator Carsten has been on top of this bill